

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was **not** written for publication and is **not** binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 18

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JORMA SUKUVAARA, GILBERT REMUE,
FRANK HEYERICK, and JOHANNES ULRICH

Appeal No. 2002-0982
Application No. 09/359,389

ON BRIEF

Before COHEN, FRANKFORT, and BAHR, Administrative Patent Judges.
COHEN, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, and 12. Claims 2 through 5 and 8 through 11 stand objected to. These claims constitute all of the claims in the application.

Appeal No. 2002-0982
Application No. 09/359,389

appellants' specification and claims, the applied teaching,¹ and the respective viewpoints of appellants and the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations which follow.

We do not sustain the rejections on appeal.

Appellants' claims 1 and 7 each include the feature, inter alia, of a plurality of pins each fitted to a corresponding one of bores in strips for forming rows of pins interspersed with rows of ribs for supporting a worksheet.

Like the examiner (answer, page 4), we readily appreciate the breadth of appellants' claims on appeal. Further, we share the examiner's point of view that elements of claims 1 and 7, i.e, a frame, ribs, strips, and pins, are readable upon side

¹ In our evaluation of the applied prior art, we have considered all of the disclosure of the document for what it

Appeal No. 2002-0982
Application No. 09/359,389

supports 11, 13, cross supports 23, 25, circuit board support bars 37, and thumb bolts 47, respectively, in the circuit board support device of Sullivan (Fig. 1). However, as to the feature referenced above relative to independent claims 1 and 7, and argued by appellants (main brief, page 5, and reply brief, page 3), we do not discern that the Sullivan reference teaches same, as explained below. It is our point of view that one versed in the art would comprehend the language of claims 1 and 7 to require more than two ribs to effect the claimed rows of pins interspersed with rows of ribs for supporting a worksheet placed thereon. This understanding of interspersed rows of pins and ribs is consistent with the underlying teaching in appellants' specification (page 31) of alternate rows of pins and teeth (of the ribs) for supporting a worksheet. The circuit board support device of Sullivan (Fig. 1) reveals only two cross supports (ribs) with thumb bolts (pins) therebetween, thus failing to teach an interspersing of rows of ribs and rows of pins, as now claimed. It is for this reason that the rejection of claims 1

Appeal No. 2002-0982
Application No. 09/359,389

since Sullivan would not have been suggestive of the feature earlier discussed.

In summary, this panel of the board has not sustained the rejections on appeal.

The decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

IRWIN CHARLES COHEN)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
CHARLES E. FRANKFORT)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge)	AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
JENNIFER D. BAHR)	

Appeal No. 2002-0982
Application No. 09/359,389

ICC:pgg
LOUIS WOO
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314